IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

|) |
|-----------------------------|
|) |
|) |
| |
|) Civil Action No. 25-61 |
| Judge Nora Barry Fischer |
|) Judge Nora Barry 1 isener |
|) |
| |
|) |
|) |
|) |
| |
|) |
|) |
| |

. .

. . .

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Presently before the Court are *pro se* Plaintiff Ronald Satish Emrit's "Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs," and his attached Complaint, filed on January 13, 2025. (Docket No. 1). This appears to be one of dozens of similar lawsuits that Plaintiff has initiated in U.S. District Courts throughout the country wherein he is seeking, among other things, \$500,000,000,000 in damages, and injunctive relief as to Defendants Elon Musk, Vivek Ramaswamy, Speaker of the House Mike Johnson, and the Department of Government Efficiency.¹ The Honorable William S. Stickman of this Court previously recognized Plaintiff's

_

This duplicative action has also been filed numerous additional Districts, including, but not limited to, all of the following Districts: District of Oregon at Civil A. No. 1:2025-cv-00071; Northern District of Iowa at Civil A. No. 1:2025-cv-00006; Eastern District of Missouri at Civil A. No. 1:2025-cv-00008; District of Montana at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00008; Eastern District of Oklahoma at Civ. A. No. 6:2025-cv-00015; District of Wyoming at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00012; Eastern District of Louisiana at Civ. A. No. 2:2025-cv-00096; Western District of Missouri at Civ. A. No. 2:2025-cv-04005; Northern District of Oklahoma at Civ. A. No. 4:2025-cv-00016; District of South Dakota at

proclivity for engaging in vexatious litigation behavior, dismissed a duplicative case that he had brought against former NBA player and current broadcaster Charles Barkley and others as frivolous and admonished him for filing such duplicative actions across multiple U.S. District Court. *See Ronald Satish Emrit v. Charles Barkley et al.*, Civ. A. No. 2:23-cv-00034-WSS, Docket No. 2 (W.D. Pa. Jan. 18, 2023).

As to this particular case, because Plaintiff is seeking to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court recognizes its duty to screen his Complaint, to construe his pro se allegations liberally and to dismiss the case if the case is frivolous and/or for failure to state a claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); see also Gochin v. Markowitz, 791 F. App'x 342, 345 (3d Cir. 2019) (district court has power to screen complaints of all parties proceeding in forma pauperis). In PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE NUMBER P60005535, also known as Ronald Satish Emrit, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ELON MUSK, et al., Defendants., No. CIV-25-00022-JD, 2025 WL 84988, at *3 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 13, 2025), the Hon. Jodi W. Dishman of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma screened this particular complaint, thoroughly discussed the numerous deficiencies, dismissed the complaint as frivolous and for failure to state a claim and denied Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, as moot. The Court agrees with this analysis and adopts it herein. No further explication is warranted.

For all of these reasons, Plaintiff's Complaint (Docket No. 1) is dismissed, as frivolous and for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and his motion to proceed in forma pauperis

Civ. A. No. 3:2025-cv-030001; Eastern District of Texas at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00016; District of Utah at Civ. A. No. 2:2025-cv-00025; District of Colorado at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00100; District of Kansas at Civ. A. No. 2:2025-cv-0212; Northern District of New York at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00059; Southern District of Iowa at Civ. A. No. 4:2025-cv-00004; Middle District of Tennessee at Civ. A. No. 3:2025-cv-00033; Middle District of Louisiana at Civ. A. No. 3:2025-cv-00025; District of New Jersey at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00160; Western District of Oklahoma at Civ. A. No. 5:2025-cv-00022; Eastern District of Tennessee at Civ. A. No. 3:2025-cv-0007; District of New Mexico at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00015; District of Connecticut at Civ. A. No. 3:2025-cv-00024; District of Hawaii at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00007; and the Western District of New York at Civ. A. No. 1:2025-cv-00012.

(Docket No. 1) is DENIED. An appropriate Order follows.

<u>s/Nora Barry Fischer</u>Nora Barry FischerSenior U.S. District Judge

Date: January 15, 2025

cc/ecf: Ronald Satish Emrit 6655 38th Lane East Sarasota, FL 34243 (first class mail)